REMARKS

Claims 13 to 27 are pending in the application, with Claims 13 and 21 being the independent claims herein. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

All of the pending claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,335,295 (Ferracini) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,394,693 (Shirley). Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Turning to specific claim language, independent Claim 13 is directed to a printing system including an image processing section and a printing section to perform printing on a printing medium based on image data. The system includes a memory for storing the image data, first processing means for executing image data magnifying processing based on first magnifying rate information, and second processing means for executing the image data magnifying processing for an image to be printed based on the image data magnified by the first processing means, based on second magnifying rate information. The first magnifying rate information is determined based on at least one of a resolution of printing performed by the printing section, a processing load to be borne by the first processing means, a capacity of the memory and a resolution shown by the image data, and a magnifying rate of the image to be printed on the printing medium based on the image data.

The applied references, namely Ferracini and Shirley, is not seen to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of independent Claim 13. In particular, the applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest first processing means for executing image data magnifying processing based on first magnifying rate information, and second processing means for executing the image data magnifying processing for an image to be printed based

on the image data magnified by the first processing means, based on second magnifying rate information. The applied art further fails to disclose or suggest that the first magnifying rate information is determined based on at least one of a resolution of printing performed by the printing section, a processing load to be borne by the first processing means, a capacity of the memory and a resolution shown by the image data, and a magnifying rate of the image to be printed on the printing medium based on the image data.

In this regard, Ferracini is seen to be directed to a method for scaling the size of a digital image by using interpolator module 104 and shrinking module 108. (Ferracini, abstract; Figs. 1 and 2; column 2, lines 60 to 68; and column 3, lines 1 to 33). In particular, the image processing in Ferracini is seen to magnify the image by scaling factor G1 using interpolator module 104 and then to shrink the magnified image by scaling factor G2 using shrinking module 108, so that the shrunk image is readable. (Ferracini, Fig. 2; column 3, lines 56 to 68; and column 4, lines 1 to 4). Although the image processing of Ferracini is seen to use an interpolation process and a shrinking process, Ferracini is not seen to use the execution of first and second magnifying processes which use first and second magnifying rates, respectively. In addition, Ferracini is not seen to disclose that a magnifying rate is based on at least one of a resolution of printing performed by the printing section, a processing load to be borne by the first processing means, a capacity of the memory and a resolution shown by the image data, and a magnifying rate of the image to be printed on the printing medium based on the image data.

In this regard, Shirley is not seen to remedy the foregoing deficiencies of Ferracini with respect to the present invention. Shirley is seen to be directed to a system for enlarging or reducing an image by inserting or by deleting rows and lines of the image data array, respectively. (Shirley, abstract; Figs. 1 and 2; column 2, lines 14 to 68; and

column 3, lines 1 to 10). Shirley, however, is not seen to disclose or suggest the use of first and second magnifying processes which use first and second magnifying rates, where a magnifying rate is based on at least one of a resolution of printing performed by the printing section, a processing load to be borne by the first processing means, a capacity of the memory and a resolution shown by the image data, and a magnifying rate of the image to be printed on the printing medium based on the image data.

"To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." M.P.E.P. § 2143.

In this case, as discussed above, neither of the applied references are seen to teach significant features of the present invention. In addition, even if Ferracini and Shirley were combined, for which combination no motivation or suggestion is seen to be provided, such a combination would not be seen to disclose or suggest the foregoing combination of features of independent Claim 13.

Accordingly, independent Claim 13 is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. In addition, independent Claim 21 is a method claim substantially corresponding to independent Claim 13 and is therefore believed to be in condition for allowance for the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent Claim 13.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same

reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 40,595

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 72187 v 1

- 5 -